

Section 3. Principles of the Phenomenological Genealogy

3.1. The Multidimensional Liminality of Consciousness

The ontology of consciousness can be understood as a multidimensional transcendental liminality. This means that consciousness exists both as the phenomenon it currently manifests and as the potential phenomena it may become. This duality is always contextually situated within a genealogical "way."

Consider an individual standing in their living room, holding car keys, preparing to leave for the store to buy cat food. In this moment, they are themselves-in-the-living-room-prepared-to-leave-for-their-cat. Their potential modes of being include becoming themselves-in-the-car-driving-to-the-store or themselves-procrastinating-leaving. These descriptions represent a fragment of the vast, multidimensional possibilities inherent in their being at any given moment.

There exists a situational context influencing this being—elements like the presence of the cat, the car, the store, the road, the house, and the living room. These contextual elements have a temporal "past" character, shaping the conditions under which the individual exists as themselves-in-the-living-room-preparing-to-leave. For instance, they would not need to go to the store if they did not own a cat.

The being of the individual is always constituted by what they are in each present moment while simultaneously being in the mode of becoming—framed by how these possibilities unfold. Traditionally, these experiences have been conceptualized through a linear understanding of temporality. However, within The Transliminal Ontologic, we eschew strictly linear temporality in favor of appreciating the multidimensional nature of the transliminal being. This being exists within and as genealogical situatedness, potentiality-to-be, and the manifold ways of Being.

3.2. Belonging and Changing: The Locus of Being-With-In-and-As

The second foundational principle involves the existentials of being-with-in-and-as, emerging from the interplay of belonging and changing. This existential signifies a state of being simultaneously alienated and at home within its own alienation. Being involves an ever-dynamic negotiation between belonging and transformation, where identity continuously shifts within evolving horizons of situatedness.

This methodological approach hinges on the genealogical nature of phenomena, understood as calls perpetually invoking subsequent possibilities of being. These genealogical relationships form a hermeneutic circle of meaning, described phenomenologically as being-with-in-and-as. They elucidate how phenomena come to mean through the way of Being, wherein Being attunes the transliminal being to its own unfolding.

3.3. Central Question of The Transliminal Ontologic: Temporality and Being

The primary objective of The Transliminal Ontologic is not solely abstract philosophical discourse on consciousness or being. These inquiries serve as secondary to the principal endeavor: to elucidate the relationship between temporality and the being of the conscious entity—the human. Distilled to its essence, the central question is: What is time?

This inquiry into time is derived from engaging with Heidegger's reworking of Husserl's temporal framework through "ekstatic temporality." While compelling, Heidegger's framework falls short when positing "being-towards-death" as the ultimate horizon structuring Dasein's temporality.

3.4. The Problem of Death as a Horizon

Why does Heidegger's framework fall short? In both Buddhist and Hindu philosophical traditions, the question of human existence is framed through the lens of suffering: Why do I suffer? Gautama Buddha, drawing upon Hindu thought, answered that the root of suffering is desire or attachment to worldly things.

Why do we become so attached? We conceive of death as an indefinitely definite given. Regardless of beliefs about an afterlife, we often treat life as "being-timely," structuring our existence around a temporal trajectory with an absolute end. Our mode of Being involves an implicit orientation toward death as an endpoint—a finite limit shaping our actions and experiences.

This conception is mediated through sociality, where others inform us about aspects of existence we haven't personally experienced. Life is conceived as beginning with birth, containing "the content of the container that I myself am." This "content" constitutes "my life," while the "container" is defined by the boundaries of birth and death.

Our entire experience becomes articulated through the finitude of life, bounded by the social mediation of birth and death. We know of our birth and death through others and history. This existential process, termed reflexive impermanence, frames personal existence as a linear journey from birth through life to death.

Returning to Buddha's insight: Why does desire arise? It arises due to this linear perception of existence, compelling us to accomplish certain tasks before death intervenes. We develop an instrumental relationship with the world, evaluating everything based on its utility toward achieving our aims before death. This generates desire—for happiness, peace, wealth, and accomplishments. These

desires must be fulfilled because, despite beliefs in an afterlife, uncertainty compels us to act as though this life is the only opportunity.

Heidegger falls short because he failed to recognize that death is not an apodictic structure of Dasein's temporality. As articulated by Buddha and Hindu philosophy, the notion of death reflects ignorance regarding the condition of conscious being. Therefore, our inquiry into the being of temporality proceeds from this perspective, aligning with both Husserl and Heidegger but refining their ideas through Eastern conceptual frameworks.

3.5. Temporality Beyond the Linear Framework

It is crucial to clarify that we do not argue Heidegger explicitly posits death as the ultimate horizon but that this perception is ingrained in human existence, shaping our understanding of temporality. Our collective experience of time has become dominated by a linear model, often obscuring the lived experience of temporality—an experience inherently multidimensional, personal, ekstatic, elastic, relational, and transcendental.

Heidegger approached temporality from phenomenological and ontological foundations, leading to his notion of "ekstatic temporality." We concur on this point. However, our critique lies in his acceptance of the conventional presupposition of death as the ultimate horizon. In contrast, the conception of time we propose is not strictly linear.

Temporality, as articulated by Buddha and echoed by Nietzsche, is fundamentally tied to our being of Goal. The structure of temporal experience arises from our pursuit of ends, goals, and engagements. Thus, temporality is shaped by how we engage with our purposes, rendering it highly malleable. This explains expressions

like "time flies when you're having fun" or "this is taking forever" when bored. The subjective experience of time varies significantly depending on engagement and emotional state.

3.6. The Transliminal Being and Temporality

For these reasons, we reconceptualize Dasein, or the human being, as the transliminal being—an "ekstatic multidimensionality" that elastically transcends itself, embodying both what it is and what it may become. It is situated within genealogically related phenomena, attuning its Being to Being itself and manifesting a fundamental concern for its ownmost existence.

This conceptualization acknowledges the complex, multidimensional, and dynamic nature of temporality, fundamentally rooted in the interplay of belonging, transformation, and existential engagement with the world.

Section 4. Addressing the Dichotomy of "Subjective" and "Objective"

4.1. Historical Context

The dichotomy between the subjective and the objective has persisted as a foundational tension within philosophical discourse, with numerous efforts aimed at reconciling these dimensions of human experience. Philosophers like Hegel sought to synthesize subjective and objective knowledge through a dialectical method, aiming for a comprehensive understanding integrating both aspects.

Immanuel Kant approached this by positing cognitive faculties that mediate between the self and the external world. He introduced the notion of a priori forms of intuition—space and time—as inherent structures of perception, synthesizing

sensory input through understanding. Kant acknowledged an "infinite distance" separating these faculties from an objective reality that cannot be fully accessed, highlighting the gap between subjective conditions of experience and the objective world.

Similarly, Thomas Nagel, in his famous "bat problem," emphasized that subjective experience cannot be fully captured by objective analysis. He argued that the richness of subjective experience is beyond the reach of reductive, objective categorization, illustrating the broader philosophical challenge of understanding experiences fundamentally alien to us.

Whether through positivism's insistence on absolute facts or radical skepticism accepting only subjective aims, the tension between subjectivity and objectivity remains a pervasive concern. The challenge lies in understanding how these realms can coexist, inform one another, and provide a coherent account of human experience.

4.2. The Concept of Being-With-In-and-As

To address this enduring tension, we turn to the existentials of being-with-in-and-as. This foundational concept allows us to grasp how the subjective and the objective are not isolated entities but interdependent aspects that co-arise, each inherently implicating the other.

The principle of being-with-in-and-as articulates that subjectivity and objectivity are always co-present, existing within and as one another. Our subjective experiences are influenced by objective contexts, while our objective understanding is informed by subjective interpretation. For example, the way an individual perceives a cultural

artifact (subjective) is inherently tied to the social and historical conditions giving that artifact its objective meaning.

Subjectivity cannot be comprehended without reference to an objective framework, just as objectivity emerges only in relation to a subjective perspective. Kant exemplifies this interplay: the subjective faculties of intuition and understanding provide the structural conditions allowing for any objective knowledge. Without these subjective conditions, the notion of an objective world would be incoherent.

4.3. Dynamic Interplay of Subjectivity and Objectivity

The existentials of being-with-in-and-as shows that subjectivity and objectivity do not exist in isolation; they co-belong within a dynamic, unfolding interplay rendering the comprehension of being possible. This interplay involves a continuous process where subjective experiences provide context for objective structures, and objective frameworks shape the interpretation of subjective insights.

The concept of with suggests that both dimensions are always present in a mutually implicative relationship. Within implies these dimensions are embedded within the same existential structure, each inherently containing elements of the other. As speaks to the expressive realization of these dimensions in their interdependent forms.

This interrelationship is not a binary opposition but a reciprocal engagement where each element invites and implicates the other. When subjectivity is foregrounded, objectivity remains a potential horizon, and vice versa. This reveals that subjectivity and objectivity are mutually implicated: the existence of one necessarily raises the concern of the other.

4.4. The Circularity of Inquiry

The interplay between subjectivity and objectivity forms a circle around the matter of concern, meaning each dimension continuously influences and redefines the other in an iterative process. Our subjective understanding might lead us to reconsider objective aspects, reshaping our perception.

This circularity contributes meaningfully to analysis and critique, ensuring neither perspective remains static or isolated. It serves as both the entry point and culmination of inquiry, underscoring the inseparability and mutual necessity of these dimensions in genuine phenomenological exploration.

By viewing subjectivity and objectivity through the lens of being-with-in-and-as, we understand their apparent opposition as a relational dynamic generating the conditions for philosophical inquiry. The tension between these dimensions is embraced as fertile ground from which deeper insights emerge.

4.5. Synthesis and Conclusion

Thus, being-with-in-and-as offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the dynamic interdependence of subjectivity and objectivity, revealing them as co-constitutive dimensions essential for inquiry into the nature of being. Any attempt to privilege one over the other leads to an incomplete understanding.

This nuanced understanding honors the depth of subjective experience, as emphasized by Nagel, while respecting the necessity of objective structures, as articulated by Kant. It offers a holistic and integrated account of human existence, where the true nature of being is revealed in the interplay, ongoing negotiation, and dynamic co-arising of both subjective and objective realities.

